

Sub C13  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10

47. (Amended) An ablation treatment apparatus, comprising:  
a multiple antenna device including a primary antenna with a longitudinal axis, and a  
secondary antenna coupled to the primary antenna and configured to be deployed at least  
partially in a lateral direction relative to the longitudinal axis with at least one radius of  
curvature, wherein the secondary antenna is configured to be less structurally rigid than the  
primary antenna and the primary and secondary antennas are configured to provide a  
selectable geometric ablation of a selected tissue mass;  
an insulation sleeve positioned on an exterior of the primary antenna;  
an energy source; and  
one or more cables coupling the energy source to the multiple antenna device.

11 [Please add the following new claim:]

12 <sup>39.</sup>  
--48. The apparatus of claim <sup>15</sup> 1, wherein the multiple antenna device includes at least  
13 two secondary antennas.--

#### REMARKS

Applicants and Applicants' attorney thank the Examiner for the many courtesies extended during the personal interview conducted on September 9, 1996.

The drawings have been objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) relative to claims 17, 37 and 38. Because claims 17, 37 and 38 have been canceled, this ground of objection is now moot.

The specification has been objected to because of incorrect reference numbers. With this Response, drawing corrections are submitted with the corrected reference numbers indicated in red.

Claims 7, 10, 11, 15, 17, 18, 21, 23, 42 and 45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. These claims have been amended to overcome this ground of rejection.

Claims 31, 34 and 42 - 46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Desai et al.

Claims 1- 15, 17 - 30, 32, 33, 35, 36, 39 - 41 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable under Desai et al. in view of the teaching of Lundquist et al.

These grounds of rejection are respectively traversed.

The claims, as currently amended, set forth that the secondary antenna and secondary arm have at least one radius of curvature and are each deployed from a primary antenna or arm. The electrodes 201 of Desai et al. do not have a radius of curvature, see Figure 2(a). Lundquist et al. does not make up for the deficiencies of Desai et al. For example, referring to Figure 13, Lundquist does not have a secondary antenna with is deployed from a primary antenna, and the deployed secondary antenna has at least one radius of curvature.

### CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is in form for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, including petition fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-2415 (Docket No. 13724-731). A duplicate copy of this paper is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

~~WILSON, SONSINI, GOODRICH & ROSATI~~

Date:

12/11/96

By:



Paul Davis, Reg. No. 29,294

650 Page Mill Road  
Palo Alto, California 94304  
(415) 493-9300